DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 745 IR 054 052

AUTHOR Baggett, Ann Utsey
TITLE Automation and Its Funding in the Library Media Centers in Secondary Schools in Georgia: A Survey.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 59p.; Masters Thesis, Georgia State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Databases; *Financial Support; *High Schools; Integrated Library Systems; *Learning Resources Centers; *Library Automation; Online Catalogs; Online Searching; Optical Data Disks; Questionnaires; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Georgia

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a study whose purpose was to determine what automation is present in the library media centers in Georgia secondary schools and how it has been funded. A three-part questionnaire was sent to the media specialists in 50% of the secondary schools in Georgia, which were randomly selected. The analysis of the results was expressed with percentages and one chi-square determination. Of the 180 questionnaires sent to secondary school media specialists, 141 (78.3%) were returned; all but 2 of the questionnaires were usable. It was found that the most prevalent types of automation were catalog/circulation systems and CD-ROM. There were 53 (38.1%) schools with circulation/catalog systems and 47 (33.8%) that were using CD-ROM. Over three-fourths of all funding was with tax dollars; less than 10% of the funding was from non-tax sources. It was concluded that there is a significant amount of automation present in the Georgia secondary schools. Contrary to the hypothesis and the study of the literature, media specialists are not using non-tax sources for funding automation, but are instead relying on traditional tax sources. The survey instrument, cover letter, and lists of CD-ROM programs cited and the distribution of online databases used in Georgia secondary schools are appended. (29 references/9 tables) (Author/MAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED345745

AUTOMATION AND ITS FUNDING IN THE LIBRARY MEDIA CENTERS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN GEORGIA : A SURVEY

by

ANN UTSEY BAGGETT

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Degree of Specialist in Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia

1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ann U. Baggett
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

120540052

ABSTRACT

AUTOMATION AND ITS FUNDING IN
THE LIBRARY MEDIA CENTERS
IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS
IN GEORGIA : A SURVEY

by

Ann U. Baggett

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine what automation is present in the library media centers in the Georgia secondary schools and how it was funded.

Methods and Procedures

A three part discriptive questionnaire was sent to the media specialists in fifty percent of the Georgia secondary schools, randomly selected.

The analysis of the results was expressed with percentages and one chi-square determination.

Results

There were 180 questionnaires sent to

secondary school media specialists, and 141 (78.3%) were returned. All questionnaires but two were usable.

The most prevalent types of automation were catalog/circulation systems and CD-ROM. There were 53 (38.1%) schools with circulation/catalog systems and 47 (33.8%) that were using CD-ROM.

Over three fourths of all funding was with tax dollars. Less than 10% of the funding was from non-tax sources.

Conclusions

The findings indicated there is a significant amount of automation present in the Georgia secondary schools. Contrary to the hypothesis and the study of the literature, media specialists are not using non-tax sources for funding automation but are relying on traditional tax sources.

Collection of Data.....23
Analysis of Data.....24
4. Results
Research Question 1.....25
Research Question 2.....26
Research Question 3.....29
Research Question 4.....30
5. Discussion and Conclusions
Findings.....34
Discussion.....35
Applications.....38
REFERENCES.....40
APPENDIXES
Appendix A (Survey Instrument.....46
Appendix B (Cover Letter).....47
Appendix C (CD-ROM Programs).....48
Appendix D (On-line Databases)....50

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Automation in Secondary School LMC.....26
2. Sources of Funding for Circulation and Catalog.....27
3. CD-ROM Program Funding.....28
4. On-line Database Funding.....29
5. Plans for Automation.....30
6. Size of School (Number of students).....32
7. Total Media Budget.....32
8. Relationship Between Budget and Automation.....33
9. Comparison of National and Georgia LMC Automation.....35

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....ii

LIST OF TABLES.....vi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....vii

CHAPTER PAGE

1. Introduction

Overview.....1

Statement of the Problem.....4

Significance of Study.....5

Assumptions, Delimitations and Limitations.....5

Definition of Terms.....6

2. Review of the Literature

Introduction.....7

State Funding Legislation.....9

Federal Funding.....11

Grant Funding.....12

Local Funding Methods.....14

Multiple Source Funding.....15

Surveys of Library Automation..18

Summary.....19

3. Methodology and Procedures

Population.....21

Instrumentation.....22

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank:

all of the media specialists who consented so graciously to participate in the survey and to share additional information which they felt would give a more accurate picture of automation in the LMC

Dr. Allen Spanjer for his professional guidance in the preparation of this paper

my fellow students in the Education Specialist Class of 1992 for their friendship

my husband for his patience

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Automation is the latest innovation for efficient storage and accurate retrieval of information in an "information rich" society. Every school library media center should have automation available for student use, but the recurring problem to this innovation is the initial and continuing expense and the inherent problem of funding in a time of austerity. Even though all library media centers are experiencing dwindling sources of income, Eisenberg (1990) says that "we cannot ignore or dismiss the tremendous potential of technology by accepting current financial limitations."

Historically LMC needs have been met in a variety of ways in addition to state and local funding. The largest source of funding after World War II was from the federal government.

After the launch of Sputnik in 1953, the federal government became concerned with American's ability to complete in the "Space Race." The government felt there was a

pressing need to provide extra money for school libraries for the purchase of current scientific materials to keep the United States competitive in the space race. To answer this need, the government enacted the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to increase the purchase of science materials for school libraries (Bard & Sakal, 1981).

In 1966 school libraries received an infusion of federal funds from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. A portion of the funds from ESEA were specifically marked for school libraries to expand their collections and increase their equipment holdings. In subsequent decades the amount budgeted by Congress has slowly decreased (Stevens, 1967).

Foundations have also given money for the benefit of school libraries. The Knapp Foundation of North Carolina gave significant grants to the American Library Association for two separate library projects, the Knapp School Libraries Project (1963-68) and the Manpower Project (1968). These projects helped fund exemplary media programs and a study of media

center personnel, respectively. (Bard & Sakal, 1981).

Another source of funding for school libraries has come from private endowments. McEachern High School in Cobb County, Georgia has received significant funds which have enabled the school to implement automation which exceeds the automation found in most other secondary schools (Sparks, 1991).

Many large corporations are a source of money for school library projects. IBM and the Tandy corporations are two of the corporations which have awarded grants to schools. Carrollton High School in Carrollton, Georgia was a recipient of special corporate grants (Rush, 1986).

Access Pennsylvania, a CD-ROM Database Project, is a statewide effort to provide an extensive database for the library patrons of Pennsylvania. The project receives funding from the state, local, and federal levels (Epler & Cassel, 1987).

Implementation of automation has been accomplished in Fulton County schools as a result of long range planning. The district

budgeted funds for automation of the LMC's over a period of several school years. The projected completion date was to be the end of the school year in 1993 (Meyers, 1991).

In this and other urban districts, planning and implementation of automation in LMC's is an on-going process, but statewide there is an absence of information on the state of automation in the LMC and the means of funding it in Georgia High Schools.

Statement of the Problem

Funding of automation in a period of retrenchment in school library media budgets is a common problem facing all media specialists. A survey of the automation that has been implemented and how it was funded can be of help to those who are planning for future automation.

The purpose of this study was to determine what LMC automation has been implemented and how it was funded in Georgia secondary schools.

The study sought answers to the following research problems:

1. To determine what library media center automation has been implemented in Georgia secondary schools

2. To determine how the LMC automation was funded

3. To identify the number of schools and districts with plans for automating the LMC

4. To determine whether school size and LMC budget amount affected LMC automation

Significance of the Study

A study of automation in Georgia secondary school LMC's could provide a basis for comparison with school LMC's at the national level. A study of automation in LMC's was done by Miller and Shontz (1989) and provided the statistics for comparison. The findings of this study could also identify the level of automation and sources being used to automate LMC's.

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

The basic assumption of this study was that automation is present in the secondary schools in Georgia.

A delimitation of this study was that only 50% of the secondary schools in Georgia were

selected. There were no elementary, middle, or junior high schools included in the survey.

A limitation of the study was that automation may only be found in a small number of the selected schools.

Definition of terms:

Automation. Random House Dictionary defines automation as "operating or controlling a mechanical or productive process by electronic means" e.g. automated catalogs, automated circulation, on-line databases and CD-ROM products.

On-line database. Electronic database, e.g. Dialog, which is accessed via computer and a modem.

Alternative funds. Monies from sources other than state, district, and local funds.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The library patron of the 21st century wants his information needs met quickly and efficiently. Irving (1988) believes that the librarian who is concerned with moving the library into the information age of the 21st century must be aware of the need to bridge the gap between people and information. Automation increases efficiency of information retrieval and increases accessibility.

According to Dr. Rosalind Miller (1989), funding is one of the barriers to the implementation of automation. If the LMC is to acquire the needed automation to meet the needs of the student, planning and financial support are vital. Resourcefulness of the media specialist is necessary to find and secure funding for automation.

According to Burlingame (1989) small libraries can take advantage of alternative funding sources to

address their automation needs and

thus make available to their patrons the advantages of an "information rich" society. However, careful planning, research to identify receptive funding sources and consistent, confident, knowledgeable communication of needs and objectives are requisite to the successful solicitation of funds.

The literature review revealed three major methods of funding LMC automation. The traditional source of funds had been tax dollars, and to this method has been added non-tax money sources, along with a combination of the two.

Prior to 1965 the majority of funding for LMC needs resulted from state and local tax money. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act enacted in 1965 during President Lyndon Johnson's term resulted in federal programs which provided an increasing federal money contribution.

When traditional sources of funding were inadequate to meet the greatly increased

financial demands of LMC automation, supplemental funds were sought. Additional or alternative funding came from foundations, corporations, endowments, and local fund-raisers. Some unusual methods of financing LMC automation were used in various individual schools.

Combining sources of money or multiple source funding was the effective method used in the completion of a large automation project in Oak Park High School in Oak Park, Illinois. An even more comprehensive automation project was successfully implemented in Pennsylvania using state, local, and federal support.

The literature review will conclude with a study of surveys of LMC automation present in the high schools in the United States. The results of these studies provided data for comparison with the automation that was found in the high schools in Georgia.

State Funding Legislation

Even though Georgia has not specificially appropriated funds for LMC automation, other states have seen the necessity for providing

special funds for the implementation of automation in school libraries.

The Kentucky legislature passed the Kentucky Education Reform Act on March 29, 1990. A part of this act included $48 million to be allocated over a two year period. The funding for this legislation came from a 1% state sales tax, 1% increase in corporate taxes, and other tax revisions. The technology included computers, telecommunications, cable television, interactive video, and satellite and microwave communication (Bruder, 1990).

New legislation in Texas provided a comprehensive educational funding plan which included money for educational technology. Implementation began in 1992-93 with $100 million for technology funding. The spending was to increase until $50 per student was budgeted for 1996-97 (Kinnamon, 1991).

Local bond referendums have provided funds for the automation of the high school media centers. A bond referendum passed in 1991 provided funds for the automation of all

of the high schools in Cobb County, Georgia (Armstrong, December, 1991).

Federal Funding

The most important federal legislation affecting the funding of media centers was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed in 1965. This became a major source of new funds for school libraries. Of the five sections, Title II directly benefitted school libraries by providing funds for books and equipment (Bard & Sakal, 1981).

Grazier (1975) expressed the need for federal funding for school libraries as "so gross as to defy solution by local dollars." Even in 1975 Grazier described the "knowledge and technology explosion" as a reason for federal assistance for libraries. Title II appropriations ranged from a low of $42.5 million in 1970 to $100 million in 1973. The size of the funding was a dramatic breakthrough in federal assistance to school libraries. The states were reminded that these dollars were additional financial support for library and instructional resources and not a substitute for state

fiscal responsibility. Frequently the infusion of funds from the federal government prompted the states to provide special grants for up-grading the LMC.

Currently there are several federal programs available to school districts. The funds from these programs can be allocated for school automation at the discretion of the administration. The programs are ESEA, Chapter II, Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, Library Services and Construction Act, the Carl Perkins Act, and the U.S.Secretary of Education's discretionary fund (Shearin, 1989).

Grant Funding

Shearin (1989) stated that the two major sources of grant funding are public and private. The federal government is the primary source of public grants and corporate foundations are the major sources of private grants.

One of the earliest grants for school libraries came from the Knapp Foundation in North Carolina. The Knapp Foundation, with leadership from the AASL, financed a

$1,130,000 nationwide demonstration project which spanned a five year period from 1963-68. The goals of the program were to demonstrate the value of school library programs, promote the use of resources, encourage development of libraries, and increase support (Bard & Sakai, 1981). One of the aims of these grants was to provide research for encouraging Boards of Education to spend more on school libraries (Schwilk, 1967).

In 1967 the Knapp Foundation granted ALA $1,163,718 for a second five-year project. The School Library Manpower Project was initiated in 1968 and provided research which gave a boost to the growth of programs and services (Bard & Sakai, 1981).

In addition to foundation gifts, corporations frequently had funds which were available for educational improvement projects. Some corporations that had corporate grant policies were Hewlett-Packard, Apple, and Syntex (Niemier, 1990). Sometimes in lieu of money, companies donated equipment that had been up-dated. One private law firm donated

dot-matrix printers which had been replaced by up-dated models (Solomon, 1990).

Local Funding Methods

Individual schools used some unusual means of financing automation. Jean Hafner, Jefferson City High School, Jefferson City, Missouri, took 20 years of accumulated library fines to purchase an automated circulation system. Darla Adams, media specialist, Berkmar High School in Lilburn, Georgia, used overdue book fines and receipts from a photocopying machine to finance automation. Adams also enlisted the financial assistance of her PTA. Another media specialist sold a variety of school supplies, buying in quantity, so there was a retail profit which could be used to subscribe to a CD-ROM reference (Haden & Niemier, 1990). In some schools, organizations like the student council funded the addition of automated reference products (Niemier,1990).

When additional funding was not available for automation, other schools charged the students for down-loading citations from the CD-ROM databases (Zink, 1990).

November (1990) found an unusual but effective method of not only generating funds for automation needs but increasing community support for the school. November directs an adult education program at the Minute Man Technical High School in Lexington, Massachusetts. The program offers instructional technology classes for patrons with personal computers but little expertise in the use of it. The fees for the courses were directed to funding additional automation.

Rush (1986) suggested several possible methods of funding automation. Automation should be included in the budget requests and if permitted, funds could be "banked" or kept from one fiscal year to the next. There was also a possibility of "capturing windfall revenues" at the end of the fiscal year. These funds are monies left after all district fiscal obligations are met.

Multiple Source Funding

When funding comes from several sources or agencies, it is known as multiple funding. One of the earliest examples of the

implementation of automation using multiple sources of funding was Oak Park High School in Chicago, Illinois. Oak Park was the recipient of a $135,000 Knapp Foundation grant, $1.5 million in Title III funds, and technical assistance and equipment from the Ampex Corporation. The school was equipped with electronic equipment and the capability for classrooom access to the materials. This electronic retrieval system was one of the first in-house networking attempts. The plans for the future included networking with the elementary schools (Schwilk, 1967).

Access Pennsylvania is a unique state-wide automation project that was funded by a combination of state, federal and local funds. The project includes public, academic, school, and special libraries. The initial holdings of 163 libraries were put on CD-ROM which could be accessed by the participating LMC's (Epler & Cassel, 1987).

The federal funding came through the Library Services Construction Act for public libraries. The sum of $200,000 in federal money was allotted in 1985 to assist in the

implementation of the state-wide CD-ROM database project. The state's financial support went primarily to retrospective conversion of the high school collections. The state funding began in 1986-87 at $200,000 (Epler & Tuzinski, 1991).

The financial obligation of the schools was to automate the circulation and provide the necessary hardware, CD-ROM drives, modems, and printers, for participating in the state database. There was also agreement to update for at least five years and absorb costs of interlibrary loan. The capital outlay by each of the schools for hardware was $8,802.69 during the first two years (Epler, 1988).

Epler and Tuzinski (1991) gave a funding profile of the Access Pennsylvania Project from 1985-86 through 1990-91. The funding from Library Construction Service Act for 1990-91 was $250,000 and the state funding was $500,000. The cost per student was $2.41 with 427 schools participating.

Multiple source funding has been used in urban school districts in Georgia. In Fulton

County in Metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia, automation of the LMC's has been accomplished with funds from local sources and Chapter II funds (Fey, B., January 1992).

Surveys of Library Automation

Miller and her associates have done random surveys of media centers in the United States and their resources on five different occasions. Miller and Shontz (1989) found that public schools were becoming involved in fund raising and in seeking gifts and grants to finance automation projects. In the survey they conducted for FY '88-'89, the respondents were subscribers to School Library Journal. The survey indicated that 6% of the schools had automated catalogs, 29% had plans to automate the catalog, 21% had an automated circulation system and 42% had plans to automate circulation. Only 8% had on-line database usage and 4% had CD-ROM technology.

The figures for available automation and future plans for automation had changed relatively little from the survey conducted by Miller and Moran (1987) in FY '86-'87.

Murphy (1990) observed a strong and steady growth of automation. In 1987 only 160 sites of automation could be identified, but the 1988-89 survey by Miller & Shontz (1989) indicated an appreciable increase.

Nearly 20% of the U.S. schools were surveyed in the Fall of 1990 Quality Education study done by Business Week. The study revealed 14.5% of the schools had a modem, 3.9% used CD-ROM products, and 3.2% used videodiscs. At the high school level only 1.4% had integrated learning systems. (1990, December 10).

Summary

The study of the literature indicated that LMC needs have been supported by various sources of funding. State and local tax money and the federal government funds in Chapter II continued to be a significant source of funds for automation, but there is evidence of the need to search for alternative or supplementary funding with non-taxed dollars, e.g. grants, endowments, and PTA projects.

The literature also indicated that automation, though expensive, was being implemented. There was also evidence that money from multiple sources was being used to purchase automation.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This was a descriptive study which used a survey methodology. The purpose of the study was to determine what automation was present in the secondary schools in Georgia and how the automation was funded.

Population

The population surveyed in this study included the school media specialists in 50% of the secondary schools listed in the Georgia State Department of Education mailing label list of the public secondary schools. The schools were selected by choosing every other secondary school in the list. The random selection did not guarantee that every school system would be represented, only that 50% of the total number of secondary schools would be included in the survey. It was decided to delimit this study to secondary schools in order to survey a larger percentage of a specific population.

Instrumentation

The survey questionnaire (See Appendix A) was designed to provide data that was needed to answer the research questions listed in Chapter 1. The questionnaire was divided into three parts.

Part I consisted of questions which identified the school population, the media budget from all sources and whether or not there was a full-time media coordinator. The questions on student body size and the budget were designed to determine whether school size and the size of the LMC budget affected the amount of funds budgeted for automation.

Part II included three questions relating to district and school goals for automation in the LMC. Question 1 asked if there was a district plan for LMC automation. Question 2 asked if there was an independent school plan for LMC automation. Question 3 asked whether automation was already in place. If the LMC was already automated, the respondent was asked to complete Part III of the questionnaire.

The questions in Part III of the questionnaire provided data to determine what

automation had been implemented and the sources of funding.

An effort was made to simplify and clarify all questions on the survey and to limit the amount of time necessary to complete the survey. The questionnaire underwent many revisions before the final draft was made.

Colleagues in the graduate program at Georgia State University reviewed the instrument and made constructive suggestions for improvement. The survey was field tested by the media specialists enrolled in the graduate course on video taping. The survey was administered before a class session and was completed in a brief period of time. Some of the suggestions were incorporated in the revision.

Collection of the Data

The questionnaire was mailed to the secondary schools in January, 1992. Enclosed was a cover letter (See Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the survey, a self-addressed, stamped envelope and the two-page questionnaire. The respondents were asked to

return the comleted questionnaire within a week.

The schools surveyed were not asked to identify themselves so that confidentiality could be maintained. Each school was identified by a number on the questionnaire. This number was used for tabulation purposes and for follow-up of non-respondents.

After one week cards were sent to the media specialists who had not responded to the questionnaire.

Analysis of the Data

The analysis of the data was accomplished with the assistance of a member of the staff in the Research Lab at Georgia State University. The number of occurrences of automation and other questions were expressed as percentages and applied to the research questions which were posed in Chapter 1. Chi-square was used to determine the relationship between the size of the LMC budget and the automation that was in place.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine what automation was present in Georgia secondary school media centers and how the automation was funded.

There were 180 questionnaires mailed to the selected secondary media specialists and 141 (78.3%) were returned. Only two questionnaires were unusable, resulting in 139 usable responses. One secondary school had been converted to an elementary school and the other questionnaire contained too many conflicting answers.

Research Question 1

What library media center automation has been implemented in Georgia secondary schools?

Table 1 shows that 9.4% of the 139 survey respondents had automated circulation only, and 1.5% had only the catalog. A larger percentage, 37.3%, had both an automated catalog and circulation system in the LMC. An on-line database was being used by 14.3% of the respondents, and 33.8% of the respondents

were using CD-ROM programs. Fifty-three (38.1%) of the respondents indicated that there was no automation in their LMC.

TABLE 1

Automation in Secondary School LMC's

Response	Frequency (n=139)	Percentage
Circulation Only	13	9.4
Catalog Only	2	1.4
Circulation/Catalog	53	38.1
On-line Database	20	14.3
CD-ROM Usage	47	33.8

Note: The frequency totals are larger than the population because respondents could respond with more than one type of automation.

Research Question 2

How was LMC automation funded?

Table 2 shows that 48 (70.6%) of the respondents who had automated the circulation and catalog systems funded them with local/state funds, and eight (11.8%) of those indicated that federal funds were used. Eight

(11.8%) were funded with multiple funds, tax money from state/local and federal sources.

TABLE 2

Sources of Funding for Circulation and Catalog

Response	Frequency (n = 68)	Percentage
Local/State	48	70.6
Federal	8	11.8
Multiple funds	8	11.8
Grant	1	1.4
Other	3	4.4
Totals	68	100.0

Thirty-one (22.3%) of the respondents indicated that the 1991-92 budget had special one-time funds, but did not indicate that the funds were solely for automation.

Forty-seven of the respondents were using a total of 169 CD-ROM programs (See Appendix). Table 3 indicates the sources of funding for these 169 programs. One hundred nineteen (70.5%) of the CD-ROM programs were purchased

with local/state funds, and 31 (18.3%) of the programs were purchased with federal funds. Nine (5.3%) of the CD-ROM programs were funded with proceeds from fund-raisers. Multiple funds, tax money sources, were used to purchase 10 (5.9%) of the programs.

TABLE 3

CD-ROM Program Funding

Response	Frequency (n = 169)	Percentage
Local/State	119	70.5
Federal	31	18.3
School funds	9	5.3
Multiple funds	10	5.9
Totals	169	100.0

There were 15 respondents who used one database and five who used two databases (See Appendix). Table 4 shows how the total of 25 on-line databases were funded. Eighteen (72%) of these databases were financed with local/state funds, and four (16%) of the

databases were financed with federal funds. Multiple funding, tax money from state/local and federal sources, was used for two of the databases while one (4%) database was funded by other funds.

TABLE 4

On-line Database Funding

Response	Frequency (n=25)	Percent
Local/State	18	72
Federal	4	16
Multiple funding	2	8
Other	1	4
Totals	25	100

Research Question 3

How many school districts had plans for automation of the LMC?

Table 5 shows that 62.6% of the secondary schools surveyed had district plans for automation,and 34.5% indicated there were no district plans for automation. Media

specialists in 27.3% of the schools indicated that there was an individual school plan for LMC automation.

TABLE 5

Plans for Automation

Response	Frequency (n=139)	Percentage
District Plan		
Yes	87	62.6
No	48	34.5
Missing cases	4	2.9
Local/School Plan		
Yes	38	27.3
No	15	10.8
N/A	3	2.2
Missing cases	4	2.9
No response	79	56.8

Research Question 4

Does the school size and LMC budget amount affect LMC automation?

Table 6 shows the size of the school. There was representation from all size categories, with the schools of 501 to 1500 students representing slightly more than 70% of the respondents.

Table 7 shows the size of the LMC budget. The budgets in the range of $5,000 to $15,000 accounted for over 50% of the budgets.

There were two chi-square determinations made. The first comparison was made between the school size and the LMC budget, but nearly half of the cell frequencies were fewer than five; therefore the probability would have been a poor estimate of the actual probability. The second comparison was between the size of the LMC budget and the automation that was in place.

The amount of the budget proved to be a significant factor in the amount of automation that was implemented in the LMC. Table 8 indicates the degree of significance between LMC budget and LMC automation, $\chi^2(4, N=137)=15.16614, p, .05$.

TABLE 6

Size of School (Number of students)

Response	Frequency (n=139)	Percentage
500 or fewer	17	12.2
501 - 1000	54	38.9
1001 - 1500	46	33.1
1501 - 2000 +	22	15.8
Totals	139	100.0

TABLE 7

Total Media Budget

Response	Frequency (n=139)	Percent
under $5,000	22	15.9
$5001 - $10,000	41	29.7
$10,000 - $15,000	39	28.2
$15,000 - $25,000	24	17.4
$25,000 +	12	8.7
Missing case	1	.1
Totals	139	100.0

TABLE 8

Relationship Between Budget and Automation

Chi-Square	Value	DF	Significance
Pearson	15.16614	4	.00437
Likelihood	15.85504	4	.00322
Mantel-Haenszel	13.80673	1	.00020

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings

After studying the results of the automation research, it was concluded that:

A little over 60% of secondary schools in Georgia had implemented some type of library media automation. The most prevalent types of automation were catalog/circulation systems and a variety of CD-ROM programs. A smaller number of the schools were accessing on-line databases.

Over 70% of the funding for LMC automation was from local/state or federal sources. Very little funding came from non-tax sources.

Slightly more than 60% of the Georgia secondary school systems had a district-wide plan for library media automation, while about one-third of the individual schools had a local plan for automation.

The LMC's with larger budgets were more likely to have automation, but school size did not influence the level of automation.

Discussion

When the results of the automation efforts in Georgia secondary schools were compared with the FY 88-89 national survey by Miller and Shontz (1989), it is apparent that secondary schools in Georgia were doing somewhat better at automating library media centers.

TABLE 9

Comparison of Automation

Automation	Miller/Shontz	Georgia
Catalog	6%	39.6%
Circulation	21%	47.4%
Database usage	8%	14.3%
CD-ROM	4%	33.8%

Table 9 shows the comparison between the LMC automation that was found in the Miller/Shontz survey and the survey of secondary school media centers in Georgia.

Using the total catalog and circulation figures in Table 1 in Chapter 4, it was evident that the automation efforts in Georgia

secondary schools exceeded the Miller/Shontz survey of School Library Journal subscribers. The Miller/Shontz survey included elementary as well as secondary school library media centers.

In the fall of 1990, Business Week surveyed 20% of the schools, elementary and secondary, in the United States and found that 14.5% used on-line databases and 3.9% used CD-ROM technology. In The Georgia survey, 14.3% of the schools used on-line databases and 33.8% used CD-ROM.

Although Georgia schools are experiencing a period of austerity, media specialists were able to obtain funds for automation. There was a high priority set on the automation of the LMC as evidenced by the percentage of LMC's that were automated.

The original hypothesis, based on the study of the literature, was that in a period of retrenchment, the media specialist would find it necessary to utilize alternative (non-tax) sources of funding, e.g. grants, fundraisers. The statistics failed to support the hypothesis. The funds used or being used

were from local/state or federal funds or a combination of the two.

There was very little use of non-tax funding. Only a few of the media specialists indicated they were using library fine money, proceeds from school stores sales and photocopying fees to implement automation or subscribe to CD-ROM products and on-line databases.

The percentage of LMC automation plans seems to indicate that automation is important to an effective media program. Some of the media specialists indicated there were long range plans for networking with the classroom and with the public library.

Many of the media specialists offered extra information on the funding of automation in the comment section of the questionnaire. Only one respondent indicated she was writing a grant for funding automation. Many of the media specialists indicated that they placed a high priority on automation.

The evidence indicated that schools with smaller LMC budgets are finding it difficult to fund automation. The initial cost as well as

the continuing costs are a problem for the media specialist, as was suggested in the literature review. It might be necessary for these schools to seek additional funding from alternative non-tax sources.

One limitation of the study was that only half of the secondary schools were surveyed and the number of repondents represented only 38.8% of the total number of secondary schools in Georgia. If it had been possible to include all of the secondary schools, the results could have been different.

A future step which would provide a more comprehensive record of automation in Georgia schools would be a survey of the elementary and junior high schools. These surveys could find evidence of the use of alternative funding, e.g. PTA fund-raisers. grant funding, endowments.

Applications

While this study revealed a lack of grant funding in the schools that were surveyed, the literature suggested that public and private grants could be important sources of funds. This absence of grant funding could indicate a

need for writing grant proposals. This might also be a topic for a Georgia Library Media Association Conference.

This study could provide information on the methods of funding that will be of value to those media specialists who are making long range automation plans.

The evidence indicates that even though budgets are smaller, funds are still available from traditional sources. When the traditional sources are not sufficient for automating the LMC, there are alternative sources which few media specialists are using.

REFERENCES

Armstrong, M.L. Telephone interview. December, 1991.

Bard, T. B. & Sakal, E. N. (1981). School Libraries in the United States Since 1945. Westport, Connecticutt: Greenwood Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 227 851.

Bruder, I. (1990, May/June). Kentucky Passes a Revolutionary Educational Reform Act. Electronic Learning, 9(8), 10.

Burlingame, D. F. (1989). The Small Library and Fund-Raising for Automation. Library Hi Tech, 7(2), 49-52.

Cheatham, B. M. (1976, December). Reflections on Library Developments. School Library Journal, 23(4), 21-25.

Eisenberg, M. B. (1990, Spring). Technology and the Library Media Program: Focus on Potential and Purpose. School Library Quarterly, 18(3), 139-141.

Epler, D. M. (1988, Summer). Networking in Pennsylvania: Technology and the School

Library Media Center, Library Trends, 37(1), 43-55.

Epler, D. M. & Cassel, R. E. (1987, Fall). Access Pennsylvania: A CD-ROM Database Project. Library Hi Tech, 5(3), 81-88.

Epler, D. M. & Tuzinski, J. H. (1991, Fall). A System for Statewide Sharing of Resources. School Library Media Quarterly, 20(1), 19-23.

Fey, B. Telephone interview. January 1992.

Grazier, M. H. (1975, July). The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title II. Library Trends, 24(1), 45-59.

Haden, C. & Niemeier, K. (1990, January/February). Finding Money for Hi-Tech. The Library Supervisor, 8(4), 24-27.

High-Tech Have-Nots. Business Week, 3191, December 10, 1990, 98.

Irving, A. (1988, February). School Libraries: Forty Years Ahead: Are You Ready Yet? School Libraries, 361(1), 10-13.

Kinnaman, D. E. (1991, January). New Legislation in Texas Establishes

Statewide Technology. Technology and Learning, 11(4), 17.

Miller, M. L. & Moran, B. (1987, June/July). Expenditures for Resources in School Library Media Centers FY '85-'86. School Library Journal, 33(10), 37-45.

Miller, M. L. & Shontz, L. (1989, June). Expenditures for Resources in School Library Media Centers. School Library Journal, 351(10), 31-40.

Miller, R. (1987, August). In Progress: Automation in Georgia's School library Media Centers. The Georgia Librarian, 24(3), 65-67.

Murphy, C. (1990) Access to Information: The Effect of Automation. The Research of School Library Media Centers. Hi Willow Research and Publishing: Castle Rock, Colorado.

Myers, D. (1991, February). Fulton County Preliminary Technology Implementation Schedule. Atlanta, GA.

Niemeier, K. (1990, December). Funding Technology for Secondary School

Libraries. Computers in Libraries, 10(11), 50.

November, A. (1990, February). Big Dreams, No Money. Classroom Computer Learning, 10(14), 18-19.

Rush, J. E. (1986, Spring). Funding Library Automation. Library Hi Tech, 141(1), 115.

Schwilk, G. L. (1967, January 15). Million Dollar Carrels. Library Journal, 92 (2), 306-309.

Shearin, J. W. (1989, September/October). Sources of Funding for School Library Media Programs. Media and Methods, 26 (1), 30.

Solomon, G. (1990, October). Creative Acquisitions. Electronic Learning, 10 (2), 12.

Sparks, J. (1991, March). Automation at McEachern High School. Microcomputers in Education workshop. Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA.

Stevens, F. (1967, January 15). ESEA Title II the First Year in Review. Library Journal, 92(2), 311-312.

Zink, S. D. (1990, February 1). Planning for the Perils of CD-ROM. Library Journal, 115(2), 51-55.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING:

PART I. DESCRIPTIVE FACTS:

(Please circle the letters that describe your school.)

1. Size of school

   a = 500 or fewer students

   b = 501-1000 students

   c = 1001-1500 students

   d = 1501-2000 +

2. Total Media Budget from all sources for 1991-92

   a = under $5000

   b = $5001 - $10,000

   c = $10,000 - $15,000

   d = $15,000 - $25,000

   e = $25,000 +

3. Are there any special one-time funds included in the 1991-92 budget?

   a. YES b. NO

4. Do you have a full-time media coordinator at the district level?

   a. YES b. NO

PART II. LONG RANGE GOALS FOR AUTOMATION

(Please circle answers.)

1. Is there a district plan for LMC automation?

   a. YES b. NO

2. If there is no district plan, do you have an in-school plan for automation?

   a. YES b. NO c. N/A Explain _____

   _____

3. Is automation already in place? a. YES b. NO

   If response is yes, please turn sheet over and answer PART III of this survey as fully as possible.

PART III.

PRESENT AUTOMATION: Please complete as fully as possible. If there is more than one funding source for an item, circle all sources that apply.

	TAX DOLLARS		NON-TAX DOLLARS			
AUTOMATION	LOCAL SYSTEM/ STATE FUNDS (1)	FEDERAL (2)	PTA (3)	PRIVATE GRANT (4)	ENDOWMENT (5)	OTHER (PLEASE EXPLAIN BELOW) (6)
Circulation Only	1	2	3	4	5	6
Catalog Only	1	2	3	4	5	6
Circulation/Catalog	1	2	3	4	5	6
On-line Database (ex. Dialog) List	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
CD-ROM Programs (List)						
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6
_____	1	2	3	4	5	6

COMMENTS _____

_____

_____

Marietta High School
121 Winn Street, N. W.
Marietta, Georgia 30064

H. W. GARRETT, PRINCIPAL

January 6, 1992

Dear Media Specialist(s),

As a graduate student in the Educational Specialist program at Georgia State University, I am conducting a survey of selected high schools in Georgia. The survey is an attempt to determine what automation has been implemented in the high schools and the sources of funding for the automation.

Only 50% of the high schools in Georgia are being surveyed, and I hope you will take a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire.

Your reply will be confidential. The number on the questionnaire is for tabulation and for follow-up purposes only.

Please complete the questionnaire as accurately and completely as possible and return it within a week, using the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely yours,

Ann U. Baggett

Ann U. Baggett
MEDIA SPECIALIST
MARIETTA HIGH SCHOOL

Enclosures

Appendix C

CD-ROM Programs Cited	#Programs
Academic America Ency.	1
Audubon Mammals	1
Bible Library	1
Birds of America	1
CIA Factbook	1
Compton's Encyclopedia	6
Countries of the World	1
DiscLit	4
Encyclopedias (titles unidentified)	8
Facts on File	3
Front Page News	1
Groller's Encyclopedia	13
Guinness Bk of Records	1
Index to Magazines & News.	1
InfoFinder (World Book)	9
Information Please	1
InfoTrac	24
Library of the Future	5
Magazine of Rock	2
Magazine Index	1
McGraw-Hill Sci and Tech	1
Magazine Summary	1

Microsoft Bookshelf	4
Microsoft Stat. of Rock	2
National Geographic Mammals	7
Newsbank	13
Petersen's	1
Proquest Mag. Index	5
Readers' Guide Abstracts	2
Reference Library	2
Resource/One	1
Shakespeare	2
Sirs	12
Time Compact Almanac	4
Toolworks	1
U.S. Atlas	6
U.S. Civics	1
U.S. History	4
U.S. His. Library of Future	1
U.S. Statistical Abstracts	1
Viet Nam	1
Webster's Dictionary	2
Word Crunchers	1
Word Perfect	1
World Almanac	2
World Atlas	7
World Fact Book	2

DATABASES IN GEORGIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Database	Number
Compuserve	1
Dialog	17
Edunet	4
GOLD	1
KNOWLEDGE INDEX	1
OCLC	1